



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,819	10/06/2003	Robert R. O'Brien	50037.200US01	3404
27488 7590 01/02/2008 MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER DAILEY, THOMAS J	
			ART UNIT 2152	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/02/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/679,819

Applicant(s)

O'BRIEN ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas J. Dailey

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-14 and 16-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-14, and 16-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3, 6-14, and 16-21 are pending.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 17, 2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6-14, and 16-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-14, 16-17, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter et al (US Pat 6,181,781 B1), hereafter "Porter," in

view of "Ring Central Products: PhoneWorks 2002" (Dated: September 30, 2002, accessed via www.archive.org at: <http://web.archive.org/web/20020603180111/ringcentral.com/products/pw2002.asp>), hereafter "Phoneworks."

6. As to claim 1, Porter discloses a system for notifying a subscriber about an event (Abstract), comprising:

a voice mail switch (Fig. 3, label 380) that is configured to receive an event and an identifier associated with the event (column 1, lines 9-12 and column 2, lines 33-36, Porter's event is the "messages from incoming calls" and the identifier is the mail box number or phone number of the "subscriber", as in column 3, lines 15-20); and

a notification server (Fig. 3, label 370) coupled to the voice mail switch that is configured to perform actions including:

receiving the event and the identifier from the voice mail switch (column 1, lines 9-12, column 2, lines 33-36, and column 5, lines 45-47);

obtaining a personal unique identifier (PUID) that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server (column 3, lines 15-21, Porter's "mailbox number" reads on the PUID),

correlating the identifier associated with the event with the PUID that identifies the subscriber registered with the notification server subscriber (column 5, lines 41-43);

generating an alert (column 5, lines 47-54); and
sending the alert to the subscriber indicating that the event occurred
(column 5, lines 47-54).

But, Porter does not disclose the notification server is coupled to a plurality of voice mail switches and further mapping the PUID that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server to a plurality of identifiers, wherein at least one of the plurality of identifiers is associated with a different voice mail switch than the other of the plurality of identifiers. Rather, Porter's invention only explicitly relates to notification with one voice mail switch and therefore there is no need from mapping multiple voice mail switch identifiers to a PUID.

However, PhoneWorks discloses a system for notifying a subscriber about an event including a notification server coupled to a plurality of voice mail switches (page 2, lines 35-40, "Notification and Forwarding..." and page 2, line 17 ("Complete voice mail system supports an unlimited number of voice mailboxes") discloses the use of multiple voice mail boxes) and further mapping a person unique identifier that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server to a plurality of identifiers, wherein at least one of the plurality of identifiers is associated with a different voice mail switch than the other of the plurality of identifiers (page 1, lines 17-23, "Microsoft Outlook and Outlook Express synchronization...", and page 2, line 17, "Complete voice mail system supports

an unlimited number of voice mailboxes,” as the system integrates with Microsoft outlook, the user ID associated with Outlook reads on a PUID, and identifiers associated with voice mailboxes (e.g., the mail box numbers) are synchronized with the user ID that is associated Outlook).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Porter and Phoneworks in order to allow notification from more than one voicemail accounts thereby eliminating the need for individual notification means for each voice mail account.

7. As to claim 13, Porter teaches a method for notifying a subscriber about an event (Abstract), comprising:

receiving an event and an identifier associated with the event at a voice mail switch (column 1, lines 9-12 and column 2, lines 33-36, Porter’s event is the “messages from incoming calls” and the identifier is the mail box number or phone number of the “subscriber”, as in column 3, lines 15-20);

forwarding the event and the identifier to a notification server(column 5, lines 45-47);

generating, on the notification server, a personal unique identifier (PUID) that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server (column 3, lines 15-21, Porter’s “mailbox number” reads on the PUID);

correlating the identifier associated with the event with the PUID that identifies the subscriber registered with the notification server subscriber (column 5, lines 41-43);

generating an alert (column 5, lines 47-54); and

sending the alert to the subscriber indicating that the event occurred (column 5, lines 47-54).

But, Porter does not disclose the notification server is coupled to a plurality of voice mail switches and further mapping the PUID that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server to a plurality of identifiers, wherein at least one of the plurality of identifiers is associated with a different voice mail switch than the other of the plurality of identifiers. Rather, Porter's invention only explicitly relates to notification with one voice mail switch and therefore there is no need from mapping multiple voice mail switch identifiers to a PUID.

However, PhoneWorks discloses a system for notifying a subscriber about an event including a notification server coupled to a plurality of voice mail switches (page 2, lines 35-40, "Notification and Forwarding..." and page 2, line 17 ("Complete voice mail system supports an unlimited number of voice mailboxes") discloses the use of multiple voice mail boxes) and further mapping a person unique identifier that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server to a plurality of identifiers, wherein at least one of the plurality of identifiers is

associated with a different voice mail switch than the other of the plurality of identifiers (page 1, lines 17-23, "Microsoft Outlook and Outlook Express synchronization...", and page 2, line 17, "Complete voice mail system supports an unlimited number of voice mailboxes," as the system integrates with Microsoft outlook, the user ID associated with Outlook reads on a PUID, and identifiers associated with voice mailboxes (e.g., the mail box numbers) are synchronized with the user ID that is associated Outlook).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Porter and Phoneworks in order to allow notification from more than one voicemail accounts thereby eliminating the need for individual notification means for each voice mail account.

8. As to claim 20, it is rejected by the same rationale set forth in claim 13's rejection.
9. As to claims 2 and 14, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claims 1 and 13, and further disclose where the alert (Porter, Fig. 5, label 580) includes an event reference (Porter, Fig. 5, label 588) that links the subscriber to the event such that the subscriber can retrieve the event through a web portal view associated with a URL (Porter, column 12, lines 61-67 and column 13, lines 1-7).

10. As to claim 3, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 1, and further disclose where the notification server is further configured to generate a personal unique identifier (PUID) associated with the subscriber (Porter, column 3, lines 15-21, Porter's "mailbox number" reads on the PUID).
11. As to claim 6, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 1, and further disclose a web service interface (Porter, Fig. 3, label 330) that is configured to allow the subscriber to register to receive the alert (Porter, column 5, lines 48-61).
12. As to claim 7, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 6, and further disclose a web service interface (Porter, Fig. 3, label 330) that is further configured to allow the subscriber to designate at least one destination where the alert is sent (Porter, column 5, lines 48-61).
13. As to claim 8, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 1, and further disclose where the notification server is further configured to log the event after the alert is generated (Porter, column 2, lines 33-36, Porter's act of storing the incoming message is logging the event).

14. As to claim 10, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 1, and further disclose where the identifier is a telephone number associated with the event (Porter, column 2, lines 33-36, it is well in the art that an event, a telephone call in Porter's voice mail system (or any voice mail system), will have a telephone number to identify it).
15. As to claim 11, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 1, and further disclose where the event is at least one of: a voice mail message, a stock price, a sports score, a product delivery message, a fax, or telephone billing information (Porter, column 1, lines 9-12 and column 2, lines 33-36, Porter's event is the "messages from incoming calls").
16. As to claim 12, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 1, and further disclose where the voicemail switch comprises a data store (Porter, Fig 3, label 390) for storing the events (Porter, column 5, lines 32-39, events are the "messages from incoming calls" and are stored as "digitised stored messages").
17. As to claim 16, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 13, and further disclose determining if the subscriber is registered to receive the alert (Porter, column 2, lines 33-36, Porter's act of storing the incoming message is logging the event).

18. As to claim 17, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 13, and further disclose logging the event (Porter, column 2, lines 33-36).

19. As to claim 19, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 13, and further disclose sending the alert to at least one destination designated by the subscriber (Porter, column 5, lines 48-61).

20. As to claim 21, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 20, and further disclose a system comprising a means for linking the subscriber to the event through a network via a URL (Porter, column 12, lines 61-67), and a means for retrieving the event through a web portal view that is associated with the URL (Porter, column 12, lines 63-67 and column 13, lines 1-7).

21. Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter in view of Phoneworks, as applied to claims 1, 13, and 14 above in view of Guthrie et al. (US Pat. No. 6,161,185) hereafter "Guthrie".

22. As to claim 9, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 1, and further disclose where the notification server is

configured to determine if the subscriber has registered to receive the alert (Porter, column 5, lines 54-61) and discarding the event when the identifier does not correlate to the subscriber (it is well known in the art that if an event is received at voice mail system (or any subscriber system) that is not associated with a subscriber that event will be discarding).

Porter and Phoneworks does not explicitly teach logging an attempt to correlate the identifier with the subscriber.

Guthrie teaches a server logging an attempt to correlate the identifier with the subscriber (column 13, lines 46-56).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Porter and Phoneworks with Guthrie in order for an operator of Porter's system to have a greater understanding of the operation of the system, i.e. the operator will be aware of what the system has done even when they are not present, resulting in enhanced control of the system.

23. As to claim 18, Porter and Phoneworks disclose the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 13, and further disclose discarding the event when the identifier does not correlate to the subscriber (column 1, lines 9-12 and column 2, lines 33-36, it is well known in the art that if an event is received at voice mail

system (or any subscriber system) that is not associated with a subscriber that event will be discarding).

Porter and Phoneworks does not explicitly teach logging an attempt to correlate the identifier with the subscriber.

Guthrie teaches logging an attempt to correlate the identifier with the subscriber (column 13, lines 46-56).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Porter and Phoneworks with Guthrie in order for an operator of Porter's system to have a greater understanding of the operation of the system, i.e. the operator will be aware of what the system has done even when they are not present, resulting in enhanced control of the system.

Conclusion

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Dailey whose telephone number is 571-270-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday; 9:00am - 5:00pm.


25. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

26. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



TJD



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
12/18/17